

SEPARATE CONTINUITY OF THE LEMPERT FUNCTION OF THE SPECTRAL BALL

NIKOLAI NIKOLOV, PASCAL J. THOMAS

ABSTRACT. We find all matrices A from the spectral unit ball Ω_n such that the Lempert function $l_{\Omega_n}(A, \cdot)$ is continuous.

The characteristic polynomial of a $n \times n$ complex matrix A is

$$P_A(t) := \det(tI_n - A) =: t^n + \sum_{j=1}^n (-1)^j \sigma_j(A) t^{n-j},$$

where I_n is the unit matrix. Let $r(A) := \max\{|\lambda| : P_A(\lambda) = 0\}$ be the spectral radius of A . The spectral unit ball is the pseudoconvex domain $\Omega_n := \{A : r(A) < 1\}$.

Let $\sigma(A) := (\sigma_1(A), \dots, \sigma_n(A))$. The *symmetrized polydisk* is the bounded domain $\mathbb{G}_n := \sigma(\Omega_n) \subset \mathbb{C}^n$, which is hyperconvex (see [3]) and hence taut.

We are interested in two-point Nevanlinna–Pick problems with values in the spectral unit ball, so let us consider the Lempert function of a domain $D \subset \mathbb{C}^m$: for $z, w \in D$,

$$l_D(z, w) := \inf\{|\alpha| : \exists \varphi \in \mathcal{O}(\mathbb{D}, D) : \varphi(0) = z, \varphi(\alpha) = w\},$$

where $\mathbb{D} \subset \mathbb{C}$ is the unit disc. For general facts about this function, see for instance [4]. The Lempert function is symmetric in its arguments, upper semicontinuous and decreases under holomorphic maps, so for $A, B \in \Omega_n$,

$$(1) \quad l_{\Omega_n}(A, B) \geq l_{\mathbb{G}_n}(\sigma(A), \sigma(B)).$$

The domain $\mathbb{G}_n$ is taut, so its Lempert function is continuous.

The systematic study of the relationship between Nevanlinna–Pick problems valued in the symmetrized polydisk or spectral ball began with [1]. In particular, it showed that when both A and B are *cyclic* (or non-derogatory) matrices, i.e. they admit a cyclic vector (see other equivalent properties in [5]), then equality holds in (1). It follows that l_{Ω_n} is continuous on $\mathcal{C}_n \times \mathcal{C}_n$, where $\mathcal{C}_n$ denotes the (open) set of cyclic matrices. On the other hand, in general, if equality holds in (1) at (A, B) , then l_{Ω_n} is continuous at (A, B)

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification*. Primary: 32F45; Secondary: 32A07.

Key words and phrases. Lempert function, spectral ball, symmetrized polydisc.

This note was written during the stay of the second named author at the Institute of Mathematics and Informatics of the Bulgarian Academy of Sciences supported by a CNRS grant (Sempetber 2009).

(see [6, Proposition 1.2]). The converse is also true, since l_{Ω_n} is an upper semicontinuous function, $l_{\mathbb{G}_n}$ is a continuous function and (1) holds.

The goal of this note is to study the continuity of l_{Ω_n} separately with respect to each argument. In [6], the authors looked for matrices B such that $l_{\Omega_n}(A, \cdot)$ is continuous at B for any A . They conjecture that this holds for any $B \in \mathcal{C}_n$, and prove it for $n \leq 3$ [6, Proposition 1.4], and the converse statement for all dimensions (see [6, Theorem 1.3]).

In the present paper, we ask for which A the function $l_{\Omega_n}(A, \cdot)$ is continuous at B for any B (or simply, continuous on the whole Ω_n). By [5, Proposition 4], for any matrix $A \in \mathcal{C}_n$ with at least two different eigenvalues, the function $l_{\Omega_n}(A, \cdot)$ is not continuous at any scalar matrix. On the other hand, $l_{\Omega_n}(0, B) = r(B)$ and hence $l_{\Omega_n}(A, \cdot)$ is a continuous function for any scalar matrix A (since the automorphism $\Phi_\lambda(X) = (X - \lambda I)(I - \bar{\lambda}X)^{-1}$ of Ω_n maps λI_n to 0, where $\lambda \in \mathbb{D}$).

We have already mentioned that if $A \in \Omega_n$ ($n \geq 2$), then the following conditions are equivalent:

- (i) the function l_{Ω_n} is continuous at (A, B) for any $B \in \Omega_n$;
- (ii) $l_{\Omega_n}(A, \cdot) = l_{\mathbb{G}_n}(\sigma(A), \sigma(\cdot))$.

Consider also the condition

- (iii) $A \in \mathcal{C}_2$ has two equal eigenvalues.

By [2, Theorem 8], (iii) implies (ii). Theorem 1 below says that the scalar matrices and the matrices satisfying (iii) are the only cases when $l_{\Omega_n}(A, \cdot)$ is a continuous function. Then the mentioned above result [5, Proposition 4] shows that (i) implies (iii) and hence the conditions (i), (ii) and (iii) are equivalent.

Theorem 1. *If $A \in \Omega_n$, then $l_{\Omega_n}(A, \cdot)$ is a continuous function if and only if either A is scalar or $A \in \mathcal{C}_2$ has two equal eigenvalues.*

Proof. Using Φ_λ and an automorphisms of Ω_n of the form $X \rightarrow P^{-1}XP$, where P is an invertible matrix, we may assume that 0 is an eigenvalue of A and the matrix is in a Jordan form.

It is enough to prove that $l_{\Omega_n}(A, \cdot)$ is not a continuous function if A has at least one non-zero eigenvalue or $A \in \Omega_n$ is a non-zero nilpotent matrix and $n \geq 3$.

In the first case, let $d_1 \geq \dots \geq d_k$ be the numbers of the Jordan blocks corresponding to the pairwise different eigenvalues $\lambda_1 = 0, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_k$. We shall prove that $l_{\Omega_n}(A, \cdot)$ is not continuous at 0. It is easy to see that A can be represented as blocks $A_1, \dots, A_l$ (with sizes $n_1, \dots, n_l$) such that the eigenvalues of A_1 are equal to zero and the other blocks are cyclic with at least two different eigenvalues (if $d_1 = d_2$). By [5, Proposition 4], we know that there are $(A_{i,j})_j \rightarrow 0$, $1 \leq i \leq l$, such that $\sup_{i,j} l_{\Omega_{n_i}}(A_i, A_{i,j}) := m < r(A)$. Taking A_j to be with blocks $A_{1,j}, \dots, A_{l,j}$, it is easy to see $l_{\Omega_n}(A, A_j) \leq \max_i l_{\Omega_{n_i}}(A_i, A_{i,j}) \leq m < l_{\Omega_n}(A, 0)$ which implies that $l_{\Omega_n}(A, \cdot)$ is not continuous at 0.

Let now $A \neq 0$ be a nilpotent matrix. Then $A = (a_{ij})_{1 \leq i, j \leq n}$ with $a_{ij} = 0$ unless $j = i + 1$. Let $r = \text{rank}(A) \geq 1$. Following the proof of Proposition 4.1 in [6], let

$$F_0 := \{1\} \cup \{j \in \{2, \dots, n\} : a_{j-1, j} = 0\} := \{1 = b_1 < b_2 < \dots < b_{n-r}\},$$

and $b_{n-r+1} := n + 1$. We set $d_i := 1 + \#(F_0 \cap \{(n - i + 2), \dots, n\})$. The hypotheses on A imply that we can choose its Jordan form so that $a_{n-1, n} = 1$, so $1 = d_1 = d_2 \leq d_3 \leq \dots \leq d_n = \#F_0 = n - r$, $d_{j+1} \leq d_j + 1$.

Corollary 4.3 and Proposition 4.1 in [6] show that for any $C \in \mathcal{C}_n$,

$$l_{\Omega_n}(A, C) = h_{\mathbb{G}_n}(0, \sigma(C)) := \inf\{|\alpha| : \exists \psi \in \mathcal{H}(\mathbb{D}, \mathbb{G}_n) : \psi(\alpha) = \sigma(C)\},$$

where

$$\mathcal{H}(\mathbb{D}, \mathbb{G}_n) = \{\psi \in \mathcal{O}(\mathbb{D}, \mathbb{G}_n) : \text{ord}_0 \psi_j \geq d_j, \ 1 \leq j \leq n\}.$$

Note that $d_j \leq j - 1$ for $j \geq 2$. Let $m := \min_{j \geq 2} \frac{d_j}{j-1}$ and choose a k such that $\frac{d_k}{k-1} = m$. If $m = 1$, then $d_j = j - 1$ for all $j \geq 2$, and if furthermore $n \geq 3$, we can take $k = 3$.

With k chosen as above, let λ be a small positive number, $b = k\lambda^{k-1}$ and $c = (k - 1)\lambda^k$. Then λ is a double zero of the polynomial $\Lambda(z) = z^{n-k}(z^k - bz + c)$ with zeros in $\mathbb{D}$. Let B be a diagonal matrix such that its characteristic polynomial is $P_B(z) = \Lambda(z)$.

Assuming that $l_{\Omega_n}(A, \cdot)$ is continuous at B , then

$$l_{\Omega_n}(A, B) = h_{\mathbb{G}_n}(0, \sigma(B)) =: \alpha.$$

Lemma 2. *If $l_{\Omega_n}(A, B) = \alpha$, then there is a $\psi \in \mathcal{H}(\mathbb{D}, \mathbb{G}_n)$ with $\psi(\alpha) = \sigma(B)$ and*

$$\sum_{j=1}^n \psi'_j(\alpha)(-\lambda)^{n-j} = 0.$$

Proof. This is analogous to the proof of Proposition 4.1 in [6]. Let $\varphi \in \mathcal{O}(\mathbb{D}, \Omega_n)$ be such that $\varphi(0) = A$ and $\varphi(\tilde{\alpha}) = B$. Corollary 4.3 in [6] applied to A shows that $\tilde{\psi} := \sigma \circ \varphi \in \mathcal{H}(\mathbb{D}, \mathbb{G}_n)$.

Now we study $\sigma_n(\varphi(\zeta)) - \sigma_n(B) = \sigma_n(\varphi(\zeta))$ near $\zeta = \alpha$. We may assume that the first two diagonal coefficients of B are equal to λ . If we let $\varphi_\lambda(\zeta) := \varphi(\zeta) - \lambda I_n$, then the first two columns of $\varphi_\lambda(\alpha)$ vanish, so $\sigma_n \circ \varphi_\lambda = \det(\varphi_\lambda)$ vanishes to order 2 at α . On the other hand,

$$\det(-\varphi_\lambda(\zeta)) = \det(\lambda I_n - \varphi(\zeta)) = \lambda^n + \sum_{j=1}^n (-1)^j \lambda^{n-j} \tilde{\psi}_j(\zeta),$$

and since the derivative of the left hand side vanishes at $\tilde{\alpha}$, the same holds for the right hand side. It remains to let $\tilde{\alpha} \rightarrow \alpha$ and to use that $\mathbb{G}_n$ is a taut domain, providing the desired ψ . $\square$

Lemma 3. *We have $\alpha^m \lesssim \lambda$; furthermore if $m = 1$ and $n \geq 3$, then $\alpha^{2/3} \lesssim \lambda$. So in all cases $\alpha \ll \lambda$.*

Proof. Note that there is an $\varepsilon > 0$ such that for $\lambda < \varepsilon$ the map $\zeta \rightarrow (0, \dots, 0, k(\varepsilon\zeta)^{d_k}, (k-1)\lambda(\varepsilon\zeta)^{d_k}, 0, \dots, 0)$ is a competitor for $h_{\Omega_n}(A, B)$. So $(\varepsilon\alpha)^{d_k} \leq \lambda^{k-1}$, that is, $\alpha^m \lesssim \lambda$.

If $m = 1$ and $n \geq k = 3$, then considering the map $\zeta \rightarrow (0, 3\lambda^{1/2}\varepsilon\zeta, 2(\varepsilon\zeta)^2, 0, \dots, 0)$ we see that $(\varepsilon\alpha)^2 \leq \lambda^3$. $\square$

Setting $\psi_j(\zeta) = \zeta^{d_j}\theta(\zeta)$, the condition in Lemma 2 becomes

$$(2) \quad a \frac{(-\lambda)^n}{\alpha} + S = 0,$$

where $a = (k-1)d_k - kd_{k-1}$ and $S = \sum_{j=1}^n \alpha^{d_j} \theta'_j(\alpha) (-\lambda)^{n-j}$. Note that $a \neq 0$. Indeed, if $m < 1$, then $d_k = d_{k-1}$ and hence $a = -d_k$; if $m = 1$, then $a = (k-1)(k-1) - k(k-2) = 1$. Since $\mathbb{G}_n$ is bounded, $|\theta'_j(\alpha)| \lesssim 1$.

By Lemma 3 and the choice of k , for any j ,

$$\alpha^{d_j} \lesssim \lambda^{(k-1)d_j/d_k} \leq \lambda^{j-1} \leq \lambda^{n-1}.$$

Thus $S \lesssim \lambda^{n-1}$. By Lemma 3 again, $\alpha \ll \lambda$, a contradiction with (2). $\square$

REFERENCES

- [1] J. Agler, N. J. Young, *The two-point spectral Nevanlinna–Pick problem*, Integral Equations and Operator Theory 37 (2000), 375–385.
- [2] C. Costara, *The 2×2 spectral Nevanlinna–Pick problem* J. London Math. Soc. 71 (2005), 684–702.
- [3] A. Edigarian, W. Zwonek, *Geometry of the symmetrized polydisc*, Arch. Math. (Basel) 84 (2005), 364–374.
- [4] M. Jarnicki, P. Pflug, *Invariant distances and metrics in complex analysis*, de Gruyter Exp. Math. 9, de Gruyter, Berlin, New York, 1993.
- [5] N. Nikolov, P. J. Thomas, W. Zwonek, *Discontinuity of the Lempert function and the Kobayashi–Royden metric of the spectral ball*, Integr. Equ. Oper. Theory 61 (2008), 401–412.
- [6] P. J. Thomas, N. V. Trao, *Discontinuity of the Lempert function of the spectral ball*, arXiv:0811.3093.

INSTITUTE OF MATHEMATICS AND INFORMATICS, BULGARIAN ACADEMY OF SCIENCES,
ACAD. G. BONCHEV 8, 1113 SOFIA, BULGARIA

E-mail address: `nik@math.bas.bg`

UNIVERSITÉ DE TOULOUSE, UPS, INSA, UT1, UTM, INSTITUT DE MATHÉMATIQUES
DE TOULOUSE, F-31062 TOULOUSE, FRANCE

E-mail address: `pthomas@math.univ-toulouse.fr`